

1 ROB BONTA
2 Attorney General of California
3 ANTHONY R. HAKL
4 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
5 JERRY T. YEN
6 Deputy Attorney General
7 State Bar No. 247988
8 1300 I Street, Suite 125
9 P.O. Box 944255
10 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
11 Telephone: (916) 210-7836
12 Fax: (916) 324-8835
13 E-mail: Jerry.Yen@doj.ca.gov
14 *Attorneys for Rob Bonta, in his official
15 Capacity as California Attorney General*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRAD D. BRINSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
**MERRICK B. GARLAND, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of the United
States; ROB BONTA, in his
official capacity as Attorney General of the
State of California; and DOES 1-10,**
Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-09076

Date: April 20, 2023
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 8
Judge: Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley
Action Filed: December 22, 2022

TO THE PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 20, 2023 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Jacqueline Scott Corley, Defendant California Attorney General Rob Bonta will and hereby does move under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for an order dismissing the California Attorney General. This motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, all

1 pleadings and papers on file in this action, and such other matters as may properly come before
2 the Court.

3 Attorney General Bonta's motion is made on the grounds that (1) Plaintiff fails to state a
4 claim under 18 U.S.C. § 925A against the California Attorney General, (2) Plaintiff's remaining
5 claims against the California Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment,
6 (3) Plaintiff's equal protection claim does not provide an independent basis for relief, and
7 (4) Plaintiff fails to establish a case or controversy against the California Attorney General as
8 required for Article III jurisdiction.

9
10 Dated: March 6, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

11 ROB BONTA
12 Attorney General of California
13 ANTHONY R. HAKL
14 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

15 */s/ Jerry T. Yen*
16 JERRY T. YEN
17 Deputy Attorney General
18 *Attorneys for Rob Bonta, in his official*
19 *capacity as California Attorney General*

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Memorandum of Points and Authorities	1
Introduction	1
Statutory and Factual Background	2
I. Firearms Background Checks in California	2
II. Plaintiff's Allegations	2
Legal Standard	3
Argument	3
I. The Complaint Does Not State a Claim Under 18 U.S.C. § 925A	3
II. The California Attorney General Is Immune From Suit Under the Eleventh Amendment	4
III. Plaintiff's Equal Protection Claim Is Subsumed by His Second Amendment Claim	6
IV. No Justiciable Controversy Exists Between Plaintiff and the California Attorney General	7
Conclusion	8

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2

	<u>Page</u>
3 CASES	
4 <i>ACLU of Nev. v. Masto</i> 5 670 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2012).....	7
6 <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> 7 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	3
8 <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> 9 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	3
10 <i>Brandsrud v. Becerra</i> 11 Case No. CV 16-164-SVW, 2018 WL 2317819 (C.D. Cal. March 14, 2018).....	3
12 <i>Carnohan v. United States</i> 13 296 Fed. Appx. 603 (9th Cir. Oct. 20, 2008)	5
14 <i>Durning v. First Boston Corp.</i> 15 815 F.2d 1265 (9th Cir. 1987).....	3
16 <i>Foster v. Carson</i> 17 347 F.3d 742 (9th Cir. 2003).....	7
18 <i>Johnson v. Riverside Healthcare Sys., LP</i> 19 534 F.3d 1116 (9th Cir. 2008).....	3
20 <i>L.A. Branch NAACP v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.</i> 21 714 F.2d 946 (9th Cir. 1983).....	5, 7
22 <i>L.A. County Bar Ass'n v. Eu</i> 23 979 F.2d 697 (9th Cir. 1992).....	4, 5
24 <i>Long v. Van de Kamp</i> 25 961 F.2d 151 (9th Cir. 1992)	4
26 <i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> 27 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	7
28 <i>Natural Res. Def. Council v. Cal. Dep't of Transp.</i> 29 96 F.3d 420 (9th Cir. 1996).....	4
30 <i>Pena v. Lindley</i> 31 898 F.3d 969 (9th Cir. 2018).....	6
32 <i>Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman</i> 33 465 U.S. 89 (1984).....	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Page		
2	<i>Pervez v. Becerra</i>	
3	Case No. 2:18-cv-02793-KJM-KJN, 2019 WL 2715621 (E.D. Cal. June 28, 2019)	6
4		
5	<i>Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Org.</i>	
6	426 U.S. 26 (1976)	7
7		
8	<i>Snoeck v. Brussa</i>	
9	153 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 1998).....	4, 7
10		
11	<i>Teixeira v. County of Alameda</i>	
12	822 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2016).....	6
13		
14	<i>Teixeira v. County of Alameda</i>	
15	873 F.3d 670 (9th Cir. 2017).....	6
16		
17	<i>Wilbur v. Locke</i>	
18	423 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir. 2005).....	4
19		
20	<i>Ex parte Young</i>	
21	209 U.S. 123 (1908).....	4, 5, 6
22		
23	STATUTES	
24		
25	18 U.S.C. § 925A.....	3, 4, 8
26		
27	United States Code	
28	Title 18 § 921(a)(33)	2, 5, 7, 8
29	Title 18 § 922(g)(9).....	<i>passim</i>
30	Title 18 § 922(t)(1).....	2
31	Title 18 § 922(t)(3).....	2
32	Title 18 § 925A	<i>passim</i>
33		
34	California Government Code	
35	§ 12510.....	1
36		
37	California Penal Code	
38	§ 243(e)	1, 2, 3
39	§ 28220.....	2
40	§ 28220(b)	2, 8
41		
42	CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
43		
44	Second Amendment	<i>passim</i>
45		
46	Eleventh Amendment.....	<i>passim</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

		<u>Page</u>
2		
3	COURT RULES	
4	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	
5	12(b)(6)	3
6	OTHER AUTHORITIES	
7	Code of Federal Regulations	
8	Title 28 § 25.5	2
9	Title 28 § 25.6	2
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2

3

INTRODUCTION

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

This case generally concerns Plaintiff Brad Brinson's eligibility to possess a firearm, and a 2018 denial of his attempt to do so. The complaint alleges that "Plaintiff has not been informed whether he is being denied by the FBI, DOJ, or both." Compl., ECF No. 1, ¶ 44. But a careful reading of the complaint and its exhibits shows that, while Plaintiff was convicted of domestic battery under California Penal Code section 243(e), it is the federal government that has determined that federal law – 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(9) – prohibits Plaintiff from possessing a firearm. Because this case concerns a federal prohibition, any claims that Plaintiff's conviction does not qualify as "misdemeanor crime of domestic violence" under federal law should be solely directed to the federal government.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Although the California Department of Justice¹ (CA DOJ) runs federal background checks for individuals seeking to purchase or possess a firearm in California, it does not have any connection to Plaintiff's prohibition imposed by operation of federal law, including the federal statute at issue in this case, sufficient for Plaintiff to maintain a suit against the California Attorney General. Moreover, the complaint contains no allegations that there was a mistake regarding Plaintiff's criminal records. Thus, Plaintiff fails to state a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 925A against the California Attorney General, and Plaintiff's Second Amendment and equal protection claims against the California Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

STATUTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. FIREARMS BACKGROUND CHECKS IN CALIFORNIA

3 A person who wants to purchase or otherwise take possession of a firearm in California
4 must pass a background check that relies on several state databases as well as the National Instant
5 Criminal Background System (NICS), which is run by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).
6 Cal. Penal Code § 28220. The CA DOJ is responsible for running this background check. *Id.*
7 Federal and state law rely on this background check process to prevent prohibited persons from
8 obtaining firearms. 18 U.S.C. § 922(t)(1); Cal. Penal Code § 28220. Federal law authorizes states
9 to administer the federal background check process, in lieu of the FBI, if they do so concurrently
10 with their own background check process. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 922(t)(3); 28 C.F.R. § 25.6. States
11 that elect this procedure are called “point of contact” states. 28 C.F.R. § 25.5. California has
12 long served as a point of contact state, and, since the enactment of Proposition 63 in 2016, the CA
13 DOJ has been required to serve as one. Cal. Penal Code § 28220(b).

II. PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS

15 In 1997, Plaintiff was convicted of domestic battery under California Penal Code section
16 243(e) and the victim was involved in a dating relationship with Plaintiff. Compl., ¶ 31. In 2014,
17 Plaintiff attempted to purchase a firearm, but, due to his 1997 conviction, was denied under
18 federal law. *Id.* ¶¶ 32-33. Plaintiff, through his counsel, then contacted counsel for the FBI
19 regarding his denial. *Id.* ¶ 34. After reviewing Plaintiff's conviction, counsel for the FBI
20 determined that the conviction did not qualify as a "misdemeanor crime of domestic violence"
21 under federal law and permitted Plaintiff to legally purchase a firearm. *Id.* ¶¶ 35 and 39.

22 In 2018, Plaintiff again attempted to purchase a firearm and was denied under federal law
23 due to his 1997 conviction. *Id.* ¶ 40; *see also id.*, Exh. D. In 2022, the FBI once again reviewed
24 his 1997 conviction record, but this time determined that he was prohibited because his
25 conviction qualified as a “misdemeanor crime of domestic violence” under federal law – 18
26 U.S.C. §§ 921(a)(33) and 922(g)(9). *Id.*, Exh. D. The FBI also directed Plaintiff to the Santa
27 Cruz County Sheriff’s Office if he wished to challenge the accuracy of his criminal record. *Id.*

1 Afterwards, in December 2022, Plaintiff filed this lawsuit against both the United States
2 Attorney General and the California Attorney General. *Id.* ¶¶ 11-12. Plaintiff asserts three claims
3 – (1) correction of erroneous information under 18 U.S.C. § 925A, (2) violation of the Second
4 Amendment, and (3) violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.*
5 ¶¶ 46-62.

LEGAL STANDARD

7 A claim may be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6) either for “lack of a cognizable legal
8 theory’ or ‘the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory.’” *Johnson v.*
9 *Riverside Healthcare Sys., LP*, 534 F.3d 1116, 1121 (9th Cir. 2008) (citation omitted). The
10 governing standard is well known. *See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007);
11 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). In addition to allegations in the complaint, the Court
12 may consider any documents attached to the complaint. *See Durning v. First Boston Corp.*, 815
13 F.2d 1265, 1267 (9th Cir. 1987).

ARGUMENT

I. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT STATE A CLAIM UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 925A

To state a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 925A against the California Attorney General, there must be an allegation that “the State provided erroneous information that proximately caused denial of a firearm.” *Brandsrud v. Becerra*, Case No. CV 16-164-SVW, 2018 WL 2317819, *3 (C.D. Cal. March 14, 2018) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 925A; *Book v. United States*, 2016 WL 6154932, at *2-3 (E.D. Wash. Oct. 21, 2016)), *adopting report and recommendation*, 2018 WL 2315941 (C.D. Cal. May 18, 2018). Here, there are no allegations that the CA DOJ provided erroneous information to federal authorities. At most, Plaintiff alleges that the CA DOJ has “taken the erroneous position that Plaintiff’s 1997 conviction under Penal Code section 243(e) prohibits him from taking lawful transfer of a firearm.” Compl., ¶ 50 (emphasis added). However, this conclusory allegation is legally insufficient to state a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 925A, as it identifies no erroneous information provided by the State. The allegation is also inconsistent with the other allegations and documents in the complaint, which show that it is the federal government’s (not the CA DOJ’s) application of a federal statute that is prohibiting Plaintiff from

1 possessing a firearm. *See id.*, Exh. D; *cf. id.* ¶¶ 34-35, Exh. A (federal government initially
 2 determining that Plaintiff was not federally prohibited by his 1997 conviction). Because there are
 3 no allegations that the CA DOJ provided erroneous information or was responsible for Plaintiff's
 4 firearms prohibition under federal law, the Court should dismiss Plaintiff's first claim for relief
 5 under § 925A against the California Attorney General.

6 **II. THE CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL IS IMMUNE FROM SUIT UNDER THE
 7 ELEVENTH AMENDMENT**

8 The remaining claims against the California Attorney General (under the Second
 9 Amendment and Equal Protection Clause) are barred by the Eleventh Amendment of the United
 10 States Constitution as a matter of law. The Eleventh Amendment prohibits federal courts from
 11 hearing suits brought by private citizens “against state agencies regardless of the nature of the
 12 relief sought.” *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); *see also*
 13 *Natural Res. Def. Council v. Cal. Dep't of Transp.* 96 F.3d 420, 421 (9th Cir. 1996).

14 The Supreme Court recognized a limited exception to Eleventh Amendment immunity in
 15 *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908). The *Ex parte Young* exception allows “suits for
 16 prospective declaratory and injunctive relief against state officers, sued in their official capacities,
 17 to enjoin an alleged ongoing violation of federal law.” *Wilbur v. Locke*, 423 F.3d 1101, 1111 (9th
 18 Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). However, for the *Ex parte Young*
 19 exception to apply the state officer “must have some connection with the enforcement of the act,
 20 or else it is merely making him a party as a representative of the State, and thereby attempting to
 21 make the State a party.” *Snoeck v. Brussa*, 153 F.3d 984, 986 (9th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Ex parte*
 22 *Young*, 209 U.S. at 157). “This connection must be fairly direct; a generalized duty to enforce
 23 state law or general supervisory power over the persons responsible for enforcing the challenged
 24 provision will not subject an official to suit.” *L.A. County Bar Ass'n v. Eu*, 979 F.2d 697, 704
 25 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also* *Long v. Van de Kamp*, 961 F.2d 151, 152 (9th Cir. 1992) (“general
 26 supervisory powers of the California Attorney General” did not “establish the connection with
 27 enforcement required by *Ex parte Young*”.) If a state official “lacks the power” to address the
 28 purported violation of federal law, this indicates that the plaintiff intends to use that official “as a

1 surrogate for the state, and thereby to evade the state's Eleventh Amendment immunity." *L.A.*
 2 *Branch NAACP v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.*, 714 F.2d 946, 953 (9th Cir. 1983)).

3 Here, the complaint makes clear that in 2022, the FBI determined that Plaintiff was
 4 prohibited from possessing a firearm under 18 U.S.C. §§ 921(a)(33) and 922(g)(9), and that the
 5 denial of Plaintiff's firearm purchase is based on federal law. Compl., Exh. D. Nevertheless,
 6 Plaintiff appears to claim that the California Attorney General violated the Second Amendment
 7 and Equal Protection Clause by determining that federal law prohibits Plaintiff from possessing a
 8 firearm. *See id.* ¶¶ 58 and 65. Plaintiff further alleges that the California Attorney General has
 9 "direct supervision over every district attorney, sheriff and all personnel managing the firearm
 10 background check system and correction of criminal records for the State of California in all
 11 matters pertaining to the duties of their respective assignments." *Id.* ¶ 12. Plaintiff goes on to
 12 claim that the California Attorney General has "direct supervisory authority over the Director of
 13 the Bureau of Firearms and Director of the Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis and the
 14 Records Review and Challenge Section." *Id.*

15 Even accepting these allegations as true, the California Attorney General "lacks the power"
 16 to contravene the FBI's determination that federal law prohibits Plaintiff from possessing a
 17 firearm, which demonstrates that Plaintiff is suing the California Attorney General "as a surrogate
 18 for the state" in an attempt to "evade the state's Eleventh Amendment immunity." *L.A. Branch*
 19 *NAACP*, 714 F.2d at 953. And the case law is clear that mere supervisory power over other
 20 officials with some connection to the alleged constitutional violations is insufficient to overcome
 21 Eleventh Amendment immunity. *See L.A. County Bar*, 979 F.2d at 704; *Carnohan v. United*
 22 *States*, 296 Fed. Appx. 603 (9th Cir. Oct. 20, 2008) (affirming the dismissal of the State of
 23 California under the Eleventh Amendment where the plaintiff sued the State under the Federal
 24 Tort Claims Act for denial of permission to purchase a handgun). Thus, Plaintiff cannot show
 25 that the *Ex parte Young* exception applies, and the Eleventh Amendment bars Plaintiff from suing
 26 the California Attorney General.

27 In a case similar to this one, the Eastern District of California granted the California
 28 Attorney General's motion to dismiss because the Eleventh Amendment barred the plaintiff's

1 claims against the California Attorney General. *Pervez v. Becerra*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02793-
 2 KJM-KJN, 2019 WL 2715621 (E.D. Cal. June 28, 2019). Like Plaintiff in this case, the plaintiff
 3 in *Pervez* was prohibited from owning a firearm under federal law. *Id.* at *1. She filed a
 4 complaint requesting an order that the CA DOJ erase, amend, or remove all mental health
 5 records. *Id.* at *2. The court, however, found that the *Ex parte Young* exception did not apply
 6 because the CA DOJ does not direct or control the mental health facilities responsible for the
 7 reporting an individual's mental health treatment, and that the role of the CA DOJ is purely
 8 administrative. *Id.* at *5. Without a direct connection to the mental health facility's
 9 determination, the court concluded that the Eleventh Amendment barred the plaintiff's claims
 10 against the California Attorney General. *Id.* at *6. The same situation exists here. There is no
 11 direct connection between the California Attorney General and the federal government's
 12 determination that Plaintiff is prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law.² Thus, this
 13 Court should reach the same conclusion as in *Pervez*, and grant the California Attorney General's
 14 motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amendment and equal protection claims under Eleventh
 15 Amendment immunity.

16 **III. PLAINTIFF'S EQUAL PROTECTION CLAIM IS SUBSUMED BY HIS SECOND
 17 AMENDMENT CLAIM**

18 The Ninth Circuit has stated that “[t]o the extent that the Equal Protection challenge is
 19 based on the Second Amendment's fundamental right to bear arms and the disparate treatment of
 20 groups in exercising that right . . . that challenge is subsumed in the Second Amendment inquiry.”
 21 *Pena v. Lindley*, 898 F.3d 969, 986 (9th Cir. 2018); *see also Teixeira v. County of Alameda*, 822
 22 F.3d 1047, 1052 (9th Cir. 2016) (stating that where an “equal protection challenge is no more
 23 than a Second Amendment claim dressed in equal protection clothing, it is subsumed by, and
 24 coextensive with the former, and therefore not cognizable under the Equal Protection Clause”
 25 (quotations marks, brackets, and internal citation omitted)), *on reh 'g en banc*, 873 F.3d 670, 676
 26 n.7 (9th Cir. 2017) (affirming dismissal of the equal protection claim “for the reasons given in the

27 ² To the extent that Plaintiff claims there was an error in his criminal history record, the
 28 FBI has directed him to contact the Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office. *See* Compl., Exh. D.

1 panel opinion”). This is the case here. Plaintiff claims that his equal protection rights have been
 2 violated because he has allegedly been improperly denied “his Second Amendment rights.”
 3 Compl., ¶ 65. Thus, Plaintiff’s equal protection claim cannot provide an independent basis for
 4 relief, and should be dismissed.

5 **IV. NO JUSTICIALE CONTROVERSY EXISTS BETWEEN PLAINTIFF AND THE**
 6 **CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL**

7 The California Attorney General also moves to dismiss because Plaintiff lacks Article III
 8 standing. As an initial matter, any standing analysis is unnecessary in the event the Court were to
 9 find this suit barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See Snoeck*, 153 F.3d at 988 (“Because the
 10 Eleventh Amendment bar conclusively ends this dispute we need not address the related issue of
 11 standing which the district court found plaintiffs lacked.”); *L.A. Branch NAACP*, 714 F.2d at 949
 12 n.3 (“We need not ask the district court on remand to find whether these powers and duties are
 13 sufficient to raise a justiciable case or controversy against the Governor in this case, however,
 14 since we hold below that he is immune from suit here under the Eleventh Amendment.”)

15 Assuming the court reaches the Article III standing issue, Plaintiff must establish the
 16 existence of a “case or controversy” between him and the California Attorney General. *See*
 17 *ACLU of Nev. v. Masto*, 670 F.3d 1046, 1061-62 (9th Cir. 2012); *Foster v. Carson*, 347 F.3d 742,
 18 745 (9th Cir. 2003). Among other things, this requires a causal connection between plaintiff’s
 19 injury and the defendant’s actions. *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992).

20 Here, Plaintiff cannot show that the CA DOJ affirmatively, or by improper omission, took
 21 any unlawful action to harm him. Again, the complaint makes clear that in 2022, the FBI
 22 determined that Plaintiff was prohibited from possessing a firearm under 18 U.S.C. §§ 921(a)(33)
 23 and 922(g)(9), and that the denial of Plaintiff’s firearm purchase was based on federal law.
 24 Compl., Exh. D. And there are no allegations that Plaintiff’s firearms prohibition is based on
 25 California law. In other words, there is no causal connection between Plaintiff’s injury (inability
 26 to possess a firearm) and any allegedly unlawful conduct by the CA DOJ. *See Simon v. Eastern*
 27 *Kentucky Welfare Rights Org.*, 426 U.S. 26, 38 (1976) (Plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge an
 28 IRS ruling because they could not show that their alleged injury, a denial of medical services, was

1 traceable to the IRS ruling, rather than to the hospitals' independent action). It is the federal
 2 government applying a federal statute that is preventing Plaintiff from acquiring a firearm. *See*
 3 Compl., Ex. D ("The FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division . . . has
 4 determined [that Mr. Bard Daniel Brinson] is not eligible to be entered into the VAF . . . [because
 5 his record] contains information that falls under the following prohibitive category: Title 18,
 6 United States Code, Sections 921(a)(33) and 922(g)(9) . . ."); *see also id.*, Exh. A, at 3 ("this is a
 7 federal prohibition issue").

8 In this particular case, the CA DOJ's role merely involves receiving information from the
 9 federal government regarding Plaintiff's prohibition. *See* Cal. Penal Code § 28220(b) ("The
 10 Department of Justice shall participate in the National Instant Criminal Background Check
 11 System (NICS), as described in subsection (t) of Section 922 of Title 18 of the United States
 12 Code"). Even though Plaintiff may disagree with the propriety of his federal firearms prohibition,
 13 that disagreement has no connection to the CA DOJ and instead should be directed to the federal
 14 government. In fact, if Plaintiff were to prevail in his challenge against the federal government's
 15 application of federal law, he would receive full relief through the issuance of an injunction
 16 against the federal government. At bottom, no case or controversy exists with respect to the
 17 California Attorney General and thus Plaintiff lacks standing to bring this suit against the
 18 California Attorney General.

19 CONCLUSION

20 The complaint does not allege that the California Attorney General was responsible for any
 21 erroneous information in Plaintiff's records or for Plaintiff's firearms prohibition under federal
 22 law. Thus, Plaintiff fails to state a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 925A against the California Attorney
 23 General. As for the Second Amendment and equal protection claims, the Eleventh Amendment
 24 bars Plaintiff from bringing those claims against the California Attorney General. And Plaintiff's
 25 equal protection claim does not provide an independent basis for relief. Moreover, Plaintiff lacks
 26 Article III standing because there is no controversy between Plaintiff and the California Attorney
 27 General. Accordingly, the California Attorney General respectfully requests that the Court grant
 28 this motion to dismiss.

1 Dated: March 6, 2023

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 ROB BONTA
4 Attorney General of California
5 ANTHONY R. HAKL
6 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

7 */s/ Jerry Yen*

8 JERRY T. YEN
9 Deputy Attorney General
10 *Attorneys for Rob Bonta, in his official*
11 *capacity as California Attorney General*

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **Brinson, Brad D. v. Merrick B. Garland, et al.** No. **3:22-cv-09076**

I hereby certify that on March 6, 2023, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

DEFENDANT CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL ROB BONTA'S NOTICE OF MOTION; MOTION TO DISMISS; POINTS OF AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS

I certify that **all** participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 6, 2023, at Sacramento, California.

Ksenia Lavrushchak

Declarant

/s/ *Ksenia Lavrushchak*

Signature

SA2022305863
36980693.docx